DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 045 073 JC 710 001

AUTHOR Park, Young
TITLE Teacher Preparation Programs and the Junior College.
INSTITUTION American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; California Univ., Los Angeles. ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Coll. Information.
PUB DATE Jan 71
NOTE 4p.
JOURNAL CIT Junior College Research Review; v5 n5 Jan 1971

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.30
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes, *Educational Research, *Junior Colleges, Research Reviews (Publications), *Research Utilization, *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This research review focuses on the need for active cooperation between the university-based researcher and the junior college administrator, to provide the research on teaching and learning necessary for the sound preparation of junior college teachers. Historically, the junior college's main concern has been student learning, and time available for activities like research was at a minimum. On the other hand, such research is of primary interest to those engaged in junior college studies at the university. One indication of the current level of cooperation is the tendency of administrators--especially those engaged in selecting new teachers--to ignore existing research on which qualities are characteristic of the properly prepared teacher. For example, the applicant's teaching ability, theories of learning, course objectives, or knowledge of the junior college commonly are not major selection criteria. Also notable is the negative attitude that many junior college administrators show towards accepting teaching interns. The uniqueness of the junior college role and environment suggests that those who teach there should receive training oriented toward particular needs. Thus, not only must the researcher be knowledgeable about current institutional practices, but also the practitioner must be aware of and contribute toward research. Accepting this, it should be obvious that the quality of both current teaching practice and existing research depends on mutual cooperation. (JO)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Volume 5, Number 5

JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW

January 1971

Published by the American Association of Junior Colleges

ED 045073

TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS AND THE JUNIOR COLLEGE

Recently, Arthur M. Cohen and Edgar A. Quimby of the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges suggested a series of research efforts that might be undertaken in the junior college (*Junior College Research Review*, September 1970). These recommendations were made on the premise that research is useful only when a user puts the results into practice. However, because the university-based researcher and the practitioner in the junior college do not communicate as well or as often as they should, the ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges attempts to bridge the gap between them.

One of the Clearinghouse's special concerns is junior college teacher preparation. This review sketches the relationships—or their lack—between junior college administrators and the university programs that address themselves to junior college instruction.

Reviews of Programs Are Available

Many aspects of teacher preparation have been discussed in previous issues of the *Junior College Research Review*. The titles of these issues reveal their special viewpoints: "The Preparation and Characteristics of the Junior College Teacher" (February 1968), "Research on Junior College Teachers" (March 1968), "Selected Teacher Preparation Programs" (May 1968), "Faculty Recruitment" (September 1969), and "Teacher Evaluation: Toward Improving Instruction" (January 1970). As with all *JCRRs*, pertinent research is cited and commented on for the information of the practitioner.

A number of teacher preparation programs have been given detailed treatment in these reviews; others are cited in various documents in the ERIC collection—e.g., the internship program for William Rainey Harper College (ED 035 407), the Faculty Development Project, cosponsored by the American Association of Junior Colleges and the Carnegie Institute (ED 034 516), the proposed Doctor of Arts in College Teaching, supported by the National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges (ED 031 205), the Appalachian State Teachers College Program (ED 015 759), and the Eastern Washington State College Interinstitutional Program (ED 016 488). Each of these programs is built on some research that relates to teaching.

In addition to these documents, many other materials related to teacher preparation are available through ERIC. An extensive account of the Junior College Teacher Program at UCLA is given by Arthur M. Cohen in *Focus on Learning: Preparing Teachers for the Two-Year College* (ED 019 939). Florence Brawer's *Personality Characteristics of College and University Faculty: Implications for the Community College* (ED 026 048) is an in-depth investigation of the personnel now teaching at the junior college with emphasis on identification of personality traits. More than a descriptive study, it suggests the kinds of research that might be undertaken on teachers and teaching.

JC 710 001

Administrators Seem to Ignore Research

Meanwhile, what is or is not happening at the junior college? The practitioner looks with disdain on "esoteric research" conducted at the university. Generally, research is considered remote from the daily problems of a teaching institution. It is questionable whether those who recruit and hire in the junior colleges (division chairmen, deans, presidents, and personnel directors) are even vaguely aware of the special aspects of the teacher preparation programs described in the reports mentioned above.

Several links are missing between the teacher trained to teach in a junior college and the means whereby the junior college recruits and selects teachers, as pointed out by Wattenbarger (ED 014 440) and Heinberg (ED 019 958), to mention but two sources. Little concern is given to whether an individual has the ability to teach. The major criterion seems to be whether or not he has a master's degree in the subject matter taught. It is costly and time-consuming for individual junior colleges to conduct extensive searches for "qualified junior college teachers"—90 per cent of fifty-eight junior colleges in California that responded to a survey indicated they had advisory committees for locating and selecting teachers in vocational fields (ED 019 958). At least one junior college district spends thousands of dollars on "recruitment trips" throughout the state and even, until recently, throughout the nation.

There are several well-established patterns followed by the junior college bureaucracy in its teacher recruitment ritual. Gerald Kennedy outlines some procedures used for the recruitment of part-time instructors (ED 027 894), and Northern Virginia Technical College reports the use of 1,225 man-hours in a four-month period merely to determine faculty needs (ED 010 020). There is much to be desired in this bureaucratic method of recruiting junior college teachers. One might ask when, if ever, the administrator discovers if the candidate can teach; what, if any, learning theory he favors; what, if any, learning objectives he will attempt to achieve; and what, if anything, he knows about the junior college.

Many Teachers Come from Secondary Education

Wattenbarger reports that 33 per cent of the nation's junior college teachers are recruited from secondary education (ED 014 283). The fact that a teaching candidate has taught in a high school merely means that the same college graduate has added several years of secondary teaching experience to whatever subject-matter knowledge he had. It is debatable whether this experience gives the prospective teacher any particular knowledge either about the junior college or about how to cause learning. In fact, a recent survey (Park, in press) showed that the majority of junior college teachers at three institutions considered themselves to be *below average or average in understanding and accepting the junior college philosophy*. Indeed,

most ranked themselves as *average or below in causing student learning*. Nearly 50 per cent of these teachers were recruited from the secondary schools.

One might seriously question why the junior college recruits so heavily from high school. Is it because the administrators themselves are primarily from the high school—bringing with them their secondary school methods and criteria—or is it because they are unaware of the special programs at the universities and colleges developed specifically to train junior college teachers? Do they really think former secondary school instructors are perforce better teachers?

How Junior College Teachers "Qualify"

Every junior college administrator knows that employing teachers affects instruction, the finances of a district, and the very core of institutional operations. Staffing within budget, a practical and relevant concern, is no longer a problem of supply and demand, but of obtaining qualified teachers. The term "qualified" is a matter of judgment, for, other than personal characteristics and a few years of teaching experience, the common denominator for junior college teaching candidates is the training received at an accredited university or college. The uncontrollable factor in the bureaucratic pattern is the personal preferences of the hiring administrator.

Barring the personal idiosyncrasies of the administrator, educational research involves training junior college teachers. Whatever criticism might be leveled at the nation's schools of education, they are still the only agencies engaged in preparing teachers. Universities and colleges produce history majors, English majors, science majors, and the like in seemingly unlimited numbers, but these subject-matter specialists are not necessarily prepared to teach in a junior college. If the junior college is to survive as something other than another educational bureaucracy, it must cooperate with the agencies involved in research on teaching. Teaching is a skill that must be learned; a master's degree does not necessarily qualify an individual as a teacher. Unfortunately, subject-matter departments at the universities and colleges, as well as junior college administrators, seem to feel that this combination is adequate for junior college teaching.

A document published by the National Council of Teachers of English on Research and the Development of English Programs in the Junior College reports that junior college teachers retain an aloofness and disdain for professional studies (ED 002 976). This attitude, according to the report, makes the junior college teacher a "fumbling amateur." The report notes the need and calls for ways to bridge the gap between subject-matter respectability and professional training. It is significant in that it deals specifically with English instruction in the two-year college and was prepared under the auspices of a major subject-area association, not a school of education.

Problems of Teaching and Learning

There are many schools of education attempting to improve teaching and learning methods through research, but the junior college has neither accepted nor contributed to that endeavor. Rather than employ a teacher trained for the junior college, administrators urge older professionals to "innovate," sometimes at a higher cost than hiring a new teacher. As a group, few junior college teachers have the time or inclination to conduct professional research. Moreover, junior college teachers feel that research refers only to subject matter. In Park's study (in press), which called for self-ratings by teachers in three institutions, most felt that the lack of time for scholarly research was a major problem—a finding that corroborated Garrison's larger study (ED 012 177). At the same time, the junior college public relations arm states that it is a comprehensive learning institution, serving the needs of the community. The contradictory view of research vs. teaching contributes to the confused image of the junior college.

The research undertaken by various institutions and foundations obviously points to the idea that the junior college is a unique educational entity. Its purpose is supposedly learning, not research, as compared with the university. If we accept the idea that the junior college is a teaching institution, should it not be interested in research on teaching and learning? If the junior college is unable to carry on the necessary research, is it not logical for it to participate in developing teacher-training programs with institutions already engaged in such research? It is as necessary for the researcher to be knowledgeable about current institutional practices as it is for the practitioner to know about research being conducted in junior college education. As one cannot exist without the other, the problem is to involve the junior college in this research. As Gleazer points out, it is a task that must be "shared alike by the universities and the junior college . . . research of the universities must be pooled with the . . . resources of the junior college" (ED 016 489).

Causing the System to Change

The avowed purpose of the junior college teacher program at UCLA is not only to train teachers to work in the jur ior college, but also to *cause change within the junior college system*. The program actively recruits and trains those candidates capable of operating within a special teaching-learning situation (ED 017 269). The missing connection between research and application might be found in a practical and feasible suggestion by Arthur M. Cohen, the program director. Each junior college would establish a "teaching chair" to be filled by an intern actively enrolled in a teacher-training program. The intern would occupy the chair for a year, with full pay and responsibilities, under the supervision of both the institution's administration and the university or college. It would be understood that this chair must be vacated and filled with a new intern each year. Variations to the basic idea are obvious, e.g., the chair could be designated for the first semester only or could be a half-time position, depending on enrollment and need.

With the increasing number of programs being created to train junior college teachers, the junior college, if it wants a voice in how teachers are trained, must decide whether it will support a profession that requires a specialized foundation in teaching and learning. If the junior college is unique in the scheme of higher learning, it should participate actively in teacher-training research.

A number of intern programs throughout the country are reviewed in the May 1968 issue of the *Junior College Research Review*. Other programs, especially in the state colleges in California, follow the high school training pattern with student teachers. Both the interns and the student teachers are part of the established methodology used by the secondary and elementary levels for years. The teaching chair might be compared with the student-teacher programs currently in practice. Supervisors of student teachers tell of many instances where the prospective teacher gained little or no actual teaching experience. Indeed, frustration to the point of depression and resignation is more often the case. The student teacher seldom has the opportunity to teach; he generally sits out his assignment in the last row of the classroom. When he actually does teach, it is usually only because the regular "master teacher" is ill or attending a conference. Whatever benefit might result from student teaching is negated by such remarks of the master teacher as "You automatically flunk 60 per cent of the students on the first exam — otherwise you get the reputation of being an easy grader."

Contrary to the negative attitude of junior college administrators toward teaching interns (noting that the junior college is supposedly a teaching innstitution) is their attitude toward administrative interns in the state of California. The rationale often given is that the administra-

tive intern is federally funded or that the position is half-time. In the experience of many, however, the administrative intern receives as little practical experience as the student teacher does. Yet administrators still see great advantages to hiring administrative interns, being trained themselves, of course, to be acceptable members of the junior college bureaucracy. This is not the case with teachers. As one administrator was heard to remark, "I'll be damned if I'll subsidize the teaching program of some college." It might be added that these same administrators spend literally millions of dollars for "innovative" gadgetry, toward which, a recent survey showed, many teachers themselves have a negative attitude (Park, in press).

The Danger of Bureaucracy

Junior college teachers and administrators have reached the point of development that generally leads to the establishment of a rigid bureaucracy. Roscoe Martin describes it as follows:

> It may be argued, indeed, that bureaucracy (in the invidious sense) is a natural concomitant of professionalism. Thus the most advanced professions are those most effected by sclerosis; by certitude of the rightness of any professional course or stand adopted; impatience with any contrary view; and suspicion of all criticism.[1]

Critical and harsh as this appraisal may be, the features of a closed system have become obvious in the junior college. One indication of it is found in Pratt's study of the relationship between the degree of authoritarianism in the personalities of public community college presidents in New York and the number of authoritarian personalities in the respective faculties they hired (ED 023 382).

The fact seems to be that the junior college bureaucracy does not wish its steadily solidifying structure to be reorganized. This applies to teachers as well as to administrators. One can only contrast the great expenditures on innovations, facilities expansion, higher wages, fringe benefits (and their accompanying higher taxes) and other operational details of a teaching institution with the total lack of investment in teacher-training programs that require little but the desire to participate.

In its growing stages, the junior college faced many obstacles, one being the difficulty of finding qualified teachers for an ill-defined role. Today it has reached that stage of development at which other educational units leveled off and entrenched themselves in a tightly organized bureaucracy, complete with dogma and sacred rituals. Blocker, Plummer, and Richardson put the matter succinctly when they pointed out that the time has come for a serious evaluation of the entire concept of the junior college and of its purposes and functions within the framework of higher education.[2]

The junior college might escape the stagnation in which the high schools found themselves before James Conant's report, by investing in teacher-training research — not on a theoretical basis, or by superficial instruction in the guise of teaching innovation, but by a realistic contribution to the process of training junior college teachers through cooperative research. It may well be the investment needed to save the junior college from oblivion.

The university-based educational researcher is not without his share of blame. He seems inclined to survey retired military personnel in the junior college (ED 010 593) and the job-seeking strategies of junior college faculties (ED 022 440) and to describe, rather than to analyze, faculty recruitment and evaluation. Yet there is an inescapable connection between the junior college and research in the university or the senior college, because these institutions are the major sources of junior college teachers. Since the educational profession is composed primarily of graduates from the university, the junior college must depend on it for providing competent instructors as well as the necessary number of bodies. Both must contribute to the study of what each is doing to enhance junior college instruction.

Young Park
UCLA/Educational Specialist

[1]Roscoe Martin, *Government and the Suburban School* (Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press, 1962).

[2]Clyde Blocker et al., *The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis* (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1965).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ED 002 976
National Conference on the Teaching of English in the Junior College, Arizona State University. *Research and the development of English programs in the junior college. Proceedings.* Tempe, Arizona, 1965, 143 p. (MF–$0.50; HC–$7.25)

ED 010 020
The documentation of steps to establish a technical college; and *The evaluation of "PERT" as a planning tool for educators,* Phase I, by Robert L. McKee. Bailey's Crossroads, Va., Northern Virginia Technical College, 1966. 80 p. (MF–$0.50; HC–$4.10)

ED 010 593
A study of potential utilization of retiring military personnel in vocational and technical education programs, Final Report, by Malcolm Richard and Perry E. Rosove. Santa Monica, California, System Development Corp. 1967. 146 p. (MF–$0.75; HC–$7.40)

ED 012 177
Junior college faculty: Issues and problems, a preliminary national appraisal, by Roger H. Garrison. Washington, D.C., 1967. 99 p. (MF–$0.50; HC–$5.05)

ED 014 283
Conference on establishing junior colleges, 1963. UCLA, Junior College Leadership Program, 1964. 137 p. (MF–$0.75; HC–$6.95)

ED 014 440
The Wisconsin teacher education research project–design and instrumentation, by Dan W. Andersen et al. Madison, Wisconsin University, 1963. 178 p. (MF–$0.75; HC–$9.00)

ED 015 759
Master's degree program for junior college teachers, by Cratis Williams. Paper presented at the 6th Annual Meeting of the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, Denver, December 1-3, 1966. 4 p. (MF–$0.25; HC–$0.30)

ED 016 488
"A formula for teacher preparation," by Shirley B. Gordon. *Junior College Journal,* 37:8, May 1967. 4 p. (MF–$0.25; HC–$0.30)

ED 016 489
"Preparation of junior college teachers," by Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr. *Educational Record,* 48:2, Spring 1967. 7 p. Not available from EDRS.

ED 017 269
Developing specialists in learning, by Arthur M. Cohen. Los Angeles, University of California, n.d. 19 p. (MF–$0.25; HC–$1.05)

ED 019 058
Junior college library orientation innovations, by Bruce L. Paulson. Los Angeles, University of California, School of Education, 1968. 34 p. (MF–$0.25; HC–$1.80)

ED 019 939
Focus on learning – Preparing teachers for the two-year college, by Arthur M. Cohen. Los Angeles, University of California, Junior College Leadership Program, 1968. 66 p. (MF–$0.50; HC–$3.40)

ED 019 958
Procedures for the supervision and evaluation of new part-time evening-division instructors in California junior colleges, by Sylvester Heinberg. Los Angeles, University of Southern California, 1966. 293 p. Available as document No. 67-405 from University Microfilms. (MF–$4.00; HC–$14.20)

ED 022 440
Job-seeking strategies of public two-year college faculties in New York State, by M. Frances Kelly. Buffalo, State University of New York. 1968. 178 p. (MF–$0.75; HC –$9.00)

ED 023 382
Flexibility of personality as it relates to the hiring and retention of public community college faculty in New York state, by George L. B. Pratt. New York University, School of Education, 1966. 110 p. (MF–$0.50; HC–$5.60)

ED 026 048
Personality characteristics of college and university faculty: implications for the community college, by Florence B. Brawer. American Association of Junior Colleges, Monograph No. 3, 1968. 104 p. (MF–$0.50; HC–$5.30)

ED 027 894
A study of the recruitment and orientation policies and practices for part-time instructors in the public junior colleges of Illinois and Maryland, by Gerald John Kennedy. College Park, University of Maryland, 1966. 379 p. (MF–$1.50; HC–$19.05)

ED 031 205
Guidelines for the prepartion of community/junior college teachers, National Faculty Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C., 1968. 12 p. (MF–$0.25; HC–$0.70)

ED 034 516
Preparing two-year college teachers for the '70's; Report of a conference, Warrenton, Virginia, November 17-19. American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968. 20 p. (MF –$0.25; HC–$1.10)

ED 035 407
A faculty internship program for William Rainey Harper College, by John R. Pirkholz. Unpublished Business Education thesis, Northern Illinois University, De Kalb, Illinois, 1969. 108 p. (MF–$0.50; HC–$5.50)

In Press
Junior college faculty: Their values and perceptions, by Young Park. American Association of Junior Colleges, Monograph No. 12, 1971.

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES

ARTHUR M. COHEN, *Principal Investigator and Director*

The Clearinghouse operates under contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education

The *Junior College Research Review* is published ten times per academic year. Annual subscriptions are $3.00 each from AAJC, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Published and copyrighted by AAJC. Copyright is claimed until January 1976.

All Clearinghouse publications are available on Microfiche (MF) or in Hard Copy (HC) from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014. Payment must accompany orders of less than $5.00 and include a handling charge of $.50 plus state sales tax when applicable.

ADVISORY BOARD

The Following Organizations Are Permanently Represented

Council of State Directors of Community Colleges (ALBERT A. CANFIELD, *Chairman*)

American Association of Junior Colleges (EDMUND J. GLEAZER, JR., *Executive Director*)

Graduate School of Education (C. WAYNE GORDON, *Associate Dean*)

University Library UCLA (ROBERT VOSPER, *University Librarian*)

Delegates *(with expiration date of term)*

WILLIAM BIRENBAUM *(June 1972)* President, Staten Island Community College, New York

CLYDE L. BLOCKER *(June 1972)* President, Harrisburg Area Community College Pennsylvania

R. DUDLEY BOYCE *(December 1971)* President, Golden West College, California

ALFREDO de los SANTOS *(June 1971)* Dean, Northampton Area Community College, Pennsylvania

DANIEL FADER *(December 1972)* Professor of English, University of Michigan

ROBERT M. HAYES *(December 1972)* Professor of Library Services, UCLA

RUSSELL P. KROPP *(December 1971)* Institute for Human Learning, Florida State University

TERRY O'BANION *(June 1971)* Assistant Professor of Higher Education, University of Illinois

JUNIOR COLLEGE RESEARCH REVIEW

American Association of Junior Colleges
One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF JUNIOR COLLEGES TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 07 1971

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION